



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



www.actproject.eu

Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

ACT MULTIPLIER EVENT E 5 – Workshop 4
Antwerp, 16 May 2018

FINAL REPORT



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

Table of contents

1. Summary of the event
 2. Multiplier event development
 3. Participants
 4. Questionnaire: results
 4. Focus group discussion: results
 4. Conclusions
- Annex: questionnaire in English



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

1. Summary of the event

The ACT Multiplier Event E5 (“Workshop 4”) was held at the University of Antwerp (City campus, Rodestraat, 14, 2000 Antwerp, room R005) on May 16th 2018, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., and was organized by the ACT UAntwerp team, i.e. Aline Remael, Isabelle Robert and Gert Vercauteren.

It was disseminated through TransMedia Benelux mailing list, through personal contacts with relevant stakeholders and also during the ADLAB PRO Multiplier Event (see <https://www.adlabpro.eu/>) on March 5th 2018, also held at the University of Antwerp (see <https://www.uantwerpen.be/en/research-groups/translation-interpreting/news--events-and-act/past-events/adlab-pro--multiplie/>).

The aim was to organize a hands-on workshop with potential experts/managers in accessibility to present the ACT project, its training possibilities and, more specifically, to present and test the course materials developed as part of IO4. Due to the evaluative nature of the workshop, a small-scale workshop was favoured, to allow for a higher interaction among participants and the materials presented were related to Unit 3a, developed by UAntwerp. In particular, the aim was to focus on:

- the introductory videos of Unit 3a (general introduction + overview of accessibility services): these two videos were chosen in order to give the participants a framework for the rest of the materials that was to be shown and to give a first idea of the video material that was developed;
- the 2 videos of Unit 3a that specifically deal with audio description: these videos were chosen because they represent a combination of an one educational video with additional material, namely an interview of an audiodescriber about her work in the AD booth in a theatre;
- the video in Unit 3a that specifically deals with hearing loops and chairs: this video was chosen because it concerns an educational video without additional material.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

It has to be noted that the materials were selected in such a way that all teachers of UAntwerp involved in the project were covered, and that the different formats (talking heads, text-on-screen, images, etc.) were covered and could be evaluated. In addition, the following materials was also submitted to the participants:

- The transcripts of the videos involved;
- The additional educational resources that have been developed;
- Part of the unit's multiple choice.

With these materials, the participants had a representative overview of all types of materials that have been developed and they could assess Unit 3a as a whole.

This document presents the Multiplier Event development, and reports on the feedback received from workshop participants. Information was gathered through two methodological tools: a questionnaire, developed by IO4 leaders (University of Antwerp) with feedback from all partners, and a final focus group discussion. The questionnaire is attached as an annex to this report.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

2. Multiplier event development

The workshop agenda was as follows:

- 10h00 - 10h10 Welcome - Aline Remael

The participants are welcomed by the Antwerp partner and presented to each other. They receive a short explanation of the design and purpose of the workshop.



Legend: Participants listening to the welcome speech

- 10h10 - 10h20 Signature Consent form

Participants are given a brief explanation of the ethical background of the workshop and sign the document in which they agree to participate in the workshop.

- 10h20 - 10h30 Presentation of the ACT project - Aline Remael

Participants are given a brief explanation about the ACT project as a whole (all IOs), so that they have a framework to evaluate the MOOC at the end of the workshop.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734



Legend: Participants listening to the presentation of the ACT project

- 10h30 - 10h45 Presentation of the MOOC - Gert Vercauteren

The actual MOOC that was developed is presented. The methodology and pedagogical principles underlying the development of the course and the actual structure of the MOOC are presented, with a brief description of the different modules/units.



Legend: Gert Vercauteren explaining the MOOC structure



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

- 10h45 - 12h00 Presentation of IO4 selected training materials - Gert Vercauteren
See section1



Legend: participants watching one of the videos of Unit 3a

- 12h00 - 13h00 Evaluation & General Discussion
As explained before, evaluation is carried out through an online survey (see annex) and a focus group.



Legend: Participants discussing the whole MOOC

- 13h00 - 14h00 Lunch & Wrap -up



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

3. Participants

For the evaluation of the Unit, participants from different backgrounds were invited, in order to obtain several points of view during the evaluation. Information from the participants was gathered through the online questionnaire. Ethical informed consents were obtained from all participants (see agenda), as well as authorization to use images for dissemination purposes (see informed consent).

Eight participants took part in the workshop, ages ranging from 26 to 61 (mean= 51.7). There were 3 male and 5 female participants, all with Dutch as mother tongue, except one with French, and all Belgian citizens. Four participants had a BA, 3 an MA and 1 a Doctoral degree. There were 1 local participant from UAntwerp (doctoral researcher) and 7 participants from 5 external organisations located in Flanders and Brussels: the association for the blinds and partially sighted *Veibes*, the Flemish theatre NTGent, the Flemish theatre *Toneelhuis*, *Accès Culture et Loisirs* (an association providing access to cultural events and leisure activities in the French speaking part of Belgium), and the University of Gent. In addition, the UAntwerp team for ACT consisted of Aline Remael (leader for UAntwerp), Isabelle Robert and Gert Vercauteren.

As far as profiles are concerned, there were consequently two participants from theatre venues, i.e. NTGent and *Toneelhuis*. The first one works at the Educational Department and Public Outreach (including accessibility) of the theatre, the second is responsible for promotion and accessibility of the *Bourla Theatre* (*Toneelhuis*).



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

4. Questionnaire: results¹

In the first question, participants were asked to rate different aspects of the workshop as a whole, along a 4-point Likert scale, from poor (1) to excellent (4). They also had the opportunity to tick off “not applicable”. The different aspects to be rated, as well as the average score for each aspect, are included in Table 1:

Table 1

| Aspect to evaluate | Average score |
|---|----------------------|
| Practical information beforehand (e.g. how to get to the venue) | 3,86 |
| Objectives of the workshop clearly communicated beforehand | 3,86 |
| Registration | 3,71 |
| Overall programme `interesting and instructive content) | 3,57 |
| Overall organisation | 3,86 |
| Venue (facilities for participating) | 3,71 |
| Venue (for coffee, lunch) | 3,71 |
| Technical support | 3,29 |
| Catering | 3,71 |
| Networking possibilities | 3,60 |
| Other | |
| Global average | 3,68 |

Table 1 shows that participants found the workshop as a whole good to excellent.

The second question dealt with their satisfaction with the overall structure of the MOOC. Again, a Likert scale was used, from “extremely dissatisfied” (1) to “extremely

¹ Results are based on 7 participants, since the answers from 1 participant seem not to have been registered, due to technical problems.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

satisfied" (7). The average score is 6.29, with a minimum score of 5. Participants could comment on their answer and three of them did:

- "Clear overview, logical structured"
- "Problem with subtitles + other fine tuning"
- "The subtitles should be changed to comply the good practices of subtitling The face-to-face explanations could be made more attractive, more 'vivid' (adding some illustrations)"

There was indeed a problem with the subtitles. We showed the videos from the Coursera platform directly, in a test phase, but it seems that Coursera used automatic subtitling as a test case, although we had delivered professional subtitles in the right format. We were not aware of this technical issue. However, the right subtitles will be used in the final version of the MOOC.

In the third question, participants were asked whether they found the overall structure of the MOOC relevant and covering the most important accessibility topics for the scenic arts. They could answer "YES", "More or less", or "NO". When they ticked off "More or less" or "No", they were asked to tell which topics were missing. All participants answered "YES", which is an important result for the MOOC and IO4 in general.

In the fourth question, participants were asked to rate different aspects of Unit 3a. These aspects, as well as the average score (4-point Likert scale, from poor (1) to excellent (4), are summarised in Table 2:



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

Table 2

| Aspect to evaluate | Average score |
|--|----------------------|
| Structure of the unit presented in the workshop | 3 |
| Length of the videos | 3 |
| Content of the videos: relevant | 4 |
| Content of the videos: clear | 3 |
| Content of the videos: informative | 4 |
| Quality of the video | 3 |
| Voice | 3 |
| Delivery speed | 3 |
| Subtitles of the video | 1 |
| Additional learning material (reading, references, etc.) | 3 |
| Evaluation (tests) | 3 |
| Other | 2 |
| Global average | 2.94 |

Results show that all aspects were rated good to excellent, except the subtitles, which is something that could have been avoided if the Coursera contact person had informed us what they had done with the subtitles. We were shocked to see how bad the subtitles were, for a MOOC where subtitling is precisely one of the topics discussed. There is a communication issue here that could have been avoided.

Again, participants could comment on their answers and two did:

- "1 video too fast (overview of services), important that there are MPC questions"
- "I found that the delivery speed of unit 3a was too high. Maybe because I was distracted by the really poor subtitles: I couldn't possibly listen and read at the same time. The material presented in that unit is more complex. I found it difficult to follow the notion of different channels because they were presented



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

beforehand and not simultaneously with the different tools. The theoretical notion took then the upper hand on the practical information.”

This point will be further discussed in section 4.

In question 5, participants were asked whether they would take the MOOC once ready on the Coursera platform. They could answer by “Yes” or “No”, and add comments. Two participants said “No”, because they were either too old or not capable of taking the MOOC for health reasons. The other said “Yes” because:

- “I’m interested based on the examples we saw”
- “Interesting for a follow-up in practice”
- “Interesting, theatre for other people with the same disabilities”
- “It gives you a clear and wide overview of the possibilities and needs for accessibility in the field”
- “curiosity”

In question 6, participants were asked whether they would prefer to take only a few units of the MOOC and if yes, which one. Consequently, they could tick off one or more units. Unit 3a got a score of 6 (max. is 7), units 1, 2 and 4 got a score of 5 and units 0 and 5 got a score of 4.

In the last question, participants were asked whether they would recommend the MOOC to potential participants. They could answer by “YES”, “Maybe”, or “NO”. Again, they were invited to comment about their answer. Five participants said they would recommend it and three of them made the following comments:

- “But for laymen: a lot of material together”
- “Excellent introduction and overview for anyone with interest in the field, apart from previous knowledge”
- “As I knew about those tools, I find it difficult to evaluate whether someone who doesn't know about this can understand it all. And at the same time, it is



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

quite basic information”

“I found the module about audiodescription very good. Only the volume of the audiodescriber's voice (in Dutch) was not good for me (too low)”

“Is there enough additional information / reading material? Or is the last module THE module to be done, with sharing of practical information between participants?”

One participant answered he would have to take the MOOC first as a whole before recommending it. A last participant said she would recommend it to her students.

5. Focus group discussion: results

At the end, a focus group discussion between participants, led by Aline Remael, was conducted, and the following observations were made, some relating to the MOOC and others more related to accessibility in the scenic arts in general:

General impression from the participants:

- Valuable project and initiative, can be used very easily when one has to find a new colleague for a short period of time to help out in the theatre (e.g. maternity leave).
- There is a lot of ignorance now, but with this kind of project, much is going to be solved. People will acquire the relevant knowledge and the right things will happen in venues.
- The great advantage is that all relevant information has been grouped and is available in one place, you don't have to search everywhere, it is all there. It is really valuable for cultural centres.
- The threshold is very low, the content is independent of prior knowledge.
- Interesting project for the promotion of accessibility, in order to make all accessibility services known.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

Impressions about the content of the MOOC:

- Positive comments:
 - Very dense, lots of information in each video, well structured, clear explanations
 - Interesting to have additional reading material or links to additional material
 - Fine to have different lecturers
 - Keywords are really helpful
 - Length of the videos is generally fine
 - Very professional but it could be "more fun" (i.e. with more images to make it more pleasant).
- Negative comments:
 - Intonation is not always successful
 - Shot changes are not always perfect
 - Sound could be better for interviews
 - Contrast (black and white) could be better
 - Reading speed of subtitles is not always good
 - Tables could be bigger
 - Longer pauses could increase comfort
 - To make video's less "boring" for young adults, more images could be added
- Questions:
 - How about the frequency of the units?
 - Is there an overview of the MOOC on the Coursera interface?

Impressions about transcripts, additional material, and assessment

- Transcripts: for some people more useful than videos, hopefully downloadable preferably in ARIAL, especially no light version, too fine certainly on white background



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

- Additional material: very useful
- Assessment: is there feedback, in addition to the right answers?

6. Conclusions

Overall, the aim of the workshop, which was to assess the general MOOC structure and IO4 materials was fulfilled, and participants provided interesting feed-back on the unit 3a output. The fact that 8 participants took part in the workshop allowed for a lively discussion and a focus group format, generating not only quantitative indicators through a survey but also qualitative input through a focus group discussion. The global assessment was very positive, with some indications for future improvement, which shows the impact and relevance of the training materials developed as part of the ACT project Intellectual Output 4.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

Annex: questionnaire in English

Introduction



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734



Multiplier event, Antwerp, 16th May 2018

Dear Madam, Dear Sir,

This questionnaire is part of the ACT Erasmus+ project on Accessible Culture and Training.

The project ACT proposes the definition of a new professional profile, that of the "Media Accessibility Expert/Manager for the Scenic Arts", and also the various types of training activities associated to this professional.

The project focuses on promoting equal opportunities and accessibility to cultural events (scenic arts) across countries and languages searching to establish and qualify the profile of accessibility expert to empower all citizens and especially people with disabilities.

Please note that there are no personal risks involved in filling in this questionnaire. All your responses will be treated with strict confidentiality and we guarantee your anonymity. Of course, you are free to discontinue your participation at any time. However, your responses are of great value to this project. That is why we would like to thank you for your time and contribution. If you have any questions or concerns or if you want to know more about the project, please feel free to contact Isabelle Robert (isabelle.robert@uantwerpen.be).

Thank you very much in advance for your participation.

Best wishes,

Aline Remael, Nina Reviere, Isabelle Robert and Gert Vercauteren, members of the Antwerp Team of the ACT project

Consent Statement: I agree to take part in this survey. I understand that the information I provide will be treated as confidential by the researcher and that my identity will be protected in the publication and presentation of any findings, and that data will be collected and processed in accordance with the University's Data Protection Policy. I am aware that I am free to withdraw at any point without giving a reason, although if I do so I understand that any responses which already form part of the data analysis may still be used.

I confirm that I am 18 years old or older and agree to take part in this research. I am also aware that I am free to withdraw at any point.

- Yes
 No

Demographics

Demographics

How old are you? e.g. 35



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to state
- Other

What is your native language?

What is your country of origin?

What is your country of residence?

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Secondary education
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Other

Where do you work? E.g. education institution, theatre, opera house, museum, etc. Please specify.

Please describe your current job or function.

Block 3

Workshop feedback



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

How would you rate the following aspects of the workshop day as a whole?

| | Poor | Average | Good | Excellent | NA |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Practical information beforehand (e.g. how to get to the venue) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Objectives of the workshop clearly communicated beforehand | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Registration | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Overall programme (interesting and instructive content) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Overall organisation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Venue (facilities for participating) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Venue (for coffees, lunch, reception, if applicable) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Technical support | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Catering | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Networking possibilities | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other <input type="text"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

How satisfied are you with the overall structure of the MOOC?

- Extremely satisfied
- Moderately satisfied
- Slightly satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Slightly dissatisfied
- Moderately dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

Please feel free to comment on the previous question.

Do you think the overall structure of the MOOC is relevant and covers the most important accessibility topics for the scenic arts?

- Yes
- More or less
- No

If you have answered "more or less" or "no" on the previous question, please explain why. If you think some topics are missing, please tell us.



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

How would you rate the following aspects of the unit itself?

| | Poor | Average | Good | Excellent |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Structure of the unit presented in the workshop | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Length of the videos | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Content of the videos: relevant | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Content of the videos: clear | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Content of the videos: informative | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Quality of the video | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Voice | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Delivery speed | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Subtitles of the videos | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Additional learning material (reading, references, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Evaluation (tests) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please feel free to comment on the previous question.

Would you like to take the MOOC when it is ready?

No, because

Yes, because



Project Ref: 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015734

Would you prefer to take parts of the MOOC only? If yes, which one(s)?

- Unit 0 - Introduction
- Unit 1 - Inclusion
- Unit 2 - Venue accessibility
- Unit 3a - Access services concepts
- Unit 3b - Access services implementation
- Unit 4 - Communication and dissemination
- Unit 5 - Management

Would you recommend the course to potential participants?

- No
- Maybe
- Yes

Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the course. Your feedback is valuable.

Thank you very much for your participation. If you want to be kept posted about the results of the project, please fill in your mail address here. Thanks again!